



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: **85.**

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 7, 2007

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

☒ **Consent** ☐ **Discussion**

SUBJECT:
EXTENSION OF TIME - SPECIAL USE PERMIT

EOT-18622 - APPLICANT/OWNER CLUB RENAISSANCE PARTNERS, LLC - Request for an Extension of Time of an approved Special Use Permit (SUP-5663) THAT ALLOWED A MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT on 1.28 acres adjacent to the southeast corner of Casino Center Boulevard and Bonneville Avenue (APN 139-34-311-058 through 65), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone and R-4 (High Density Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Reese). Staff recommends APPROVAL.

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Justification Letter
5. City Council approval letter for SUP-5663

Motion made by GARY REESE to Hold in Abeyance Item 85 [EOT-18622] and Item 86 [EOT-18623] to 2/21/2007

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

LOIS TARKANIAN, LAWRENCE WEEKLY, LARRY BROWN, OSCAR B. GOODMAN, GARY REESE, STEVE WOLFSON, STEVEN D. ROSS; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

LEONARD MESSINA explained they are 85 percent complete with structural and mechanical drawings. They are victims of construction costs. Financing has dried up for Las Vegas. They are redesigning the project to where it is affordable to people. He verified for MAYOR GOODMAN that the project they first brought forward is still scheduled to be built. They are negotiating a joint venture with large construction companies to help finance this project. He

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 7, 2007

indicated that it might be a year before the project is complete. MAYOR GOODMAN was not interested in a year. If the project is not moving forward, he does not want to allow the extension to go forward for another year.

MR. MESSINA reiterated that it is possible that they can build 912 units; if not they will build less units. They are exploring many other designs and construction methods to come up with something that is affordable. MAYOR GOODMAN felt that this project will not be built. MR. MESSINA stated that there is a 30 percent possibility that this project will go forward in some other form. They have spent close to 9 million dollars so far. MAYOR GOODMAN felt the applicant should come up with a plan that the Council could consider. MR. MESSINA asked for another year to complete negotiations. MAYOR GOODMAN was amenable to granting a 60-day extension.

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that these are privately held properties and the market impacts these projects. Two years has traditionally been the timeframe and it takes a year to get plans submitted. He felt uncomfortable denying the one-year request, especially in a market that is volatile. However, he would support whatever motion is made. MAYOR GOODMAN replied that he wants to ensure that this project is built. MR. MESSINA stated that the development climate in the entire Valley is not good. Construction costs are driving land prices down. There is a labor shortage and sub-contractors are too expensive in Nevada.

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked if the applicant can demonstrate what he has done to have this project complete. MR. MESSINA replied affirmatively, which prompted the Mayor to abey both applications for two weeks so that MR. MESSINA could meet with the Councilmembers and show what he has accomplished so far. MR. MESSINA was amenable to the request.

COUNCILMAN WOLFSON asked if an extension can be granted up to a certain period of time rather than a six-month or one-year extension, and then ask for periodic follow-ups with staff. The applicant could report to staff on a monthly basis. If the Council is not satisfied that steps are being taken, the project can be brought back earlier to Council for review. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT replied that normally this does not happen on the site plan review, but special use permits can be reviewed at any time.